

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

TYLER JOHN BUCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES,  
LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-5975RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Joint Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #49. The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the requirement that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as stated by Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's model protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" The parties have not followed these instructions and instead lists the following: "[p]roprietary and confidential documents detailing practices and procedures the public dissemination of which could result in a competitive disadvantage to the disclosing party or potentially compromise data security and/or fraud

1 prevention processes; confidential personal, business or financial information; private financial  
2 information; valuable research, development, commercial, financial, technical, and/or other  
3 proprietary information not specifically identified herein; commercial information (including  
4 information implicating privacy rights of third parties); and information otherwise generally  
5 unavailable to the public, or which may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure  
6 under state or federal statutes, court rules, case decisions, or common law.” Dkt. #49 at 1–2.

7  
8 The Court finds that the parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide  
9 variety of documents as confidential, including categories that can be summed up as “sensitive  
10 business material.” The parties submit no argument to justify this departure from the model  
11 protective order’s guidelines. Accordingly, this Motion will be denied.

12 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby  
13 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ Joint Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #49, is DENIED.

14 DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023.

15  
16  
17 

18 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27